Minutes from November 9, 2004
CBS Bureau Communication/Scheduling Meeting

Attendees: NIST: Wendy Wiles, Sarah Tuohy and Scott Montgomery
NOAA: Steven Brunvoll and Bill Holdsworth
EDA: Ghee Tara and Althea Thompson
Census: Via telephone – Gary Gilbertson and Donna Kobus
CSC: Amy Sommerville, Patricia Jackson (facilitator), Tony Akande,
Ron Smith, Charles Joyce and Kesha Pendergrast

Date/Time: November 9, 2004, 10 am to noon

Purpose: User Communication and Scheduling Kickoff

Topics discussed (not in chronological order):

A. Purpose of the Meeting
1. The purpose will be to communicate status of CSC initiatives to include AR's and projects, scheduling of deliveries and the Bureaus implementation plans, to discuss and understand the impact to the Bureau CBS managers and end users, and raise concerns to CSC management.
2. The tools that the CSC currently use to communicate were discussed; this includes the standard meetings with the Bureaus, the various AR reports, and the web pages which documents project plans and delivery documentation.
3. Patricia facilitated a discussion that reviewed the current meetings that are already established to communicate with various components of the bureaus. She discussed how this meeting would be different with the other meetings already established.
4. The team decided tentatively on a regular meeting time of the 2nd Wednesday of the month from 10 am to noon.

B. CSC/Bureau Communication/Scheduling Approach
1. The AR Report Distribution list was then reviewed. Patricia walked through the reports currently being distributed to the bureaus and asked for input on satisfaction level, modification, and/or enhancements. The team felt that a complete open AR report for all levels that was sorted by modules and number would be helpful. Discussions were held around the size of the report and Patricia requested that the bureaus look through the AR's considered open and perform a data scrub. The PDF version is not preferred by the bureaus due to the inability to re-sort the information. The CSC will explore the option of using a web link to access the report through the CSC internet site.
2. The CSC web page was discussed and Patricia reminded the audience of all the useful information that can be obtained through the site.

3. Census asked if a target date can be provided on the AR reports. Patricia pointed out that all of the AR reports included a status and the date that this status change occurred or was expected to be completed.
4. Patricia offered to make daily calls to bureau reps for AR status if needed. Only Steve from NOAA accepted this offer. NIST requested weekly calls, Census was undecided, and EDA stated that they will call CSC as needed.

C. CSC Level 1 AR Process

1. Overall the participants were satisfied with the process for developing and delivering level 1 ARs. EDA was the only Bureau that indicated a desire to have the level 1 ARs consolidated and delivered at the end of the week. The other Bureaus wanted the ARs delivered as they were completed, citing that they would test and promote there level 1 ARs as they were received. The Bureaus acknowledged that sometimes the need to promote a critical fix resulted in them promoting code out of order.
2. Bureau feedback was requested on the TAC process. The Bureaus asked that the CSC provide the TAC contact names, so that could confirm that the data was still appropriate.
3. Bureaus were asked to evaluate the AR form and provide recommendations for improvement.
4. Bureau were also cautioned that the CSC would start looking at the level 1 ARs more critically and demote those that did not met the criteria of a level 1 AR.
5. Bureaus were reminded to communicate the ARs within their Bureaus before submitting to the CSC and to be more critical in their evaluation of level 1 ARs. Patricia indicated that as the CSC had 29 level 1 ARs all resources were basically working on the level 1 ARs and this would negatively impact the number of ARs that would be provided in the December Maintenance Release.
6. Bureaus recommended that the Level 1 ARs be e-mailed to the Committee members so that they could be informed and provide workarounds or other input. The Bureaus indicated that they did not want a role in prioritizing the level 1 ARs.

D. CSC Standard Maintenance Process – Level 2

1. The participants discussed the level 2 process. Overall, the consensus was to have bi-monthly meetings to collectively prioritize level 2 AR's. The benefits of grouping similar ARs was also discussed as a goal for the subcommittee. This meeting would also provide communication of what was being requested by the other Bureaus for the maintenance release. The Bureaus requested a preliminary evaluation of the ARs to determine if the level of effort would be high, medium, or low. The CSC agreed to evaluate the process (seeing when and what information would be available) and develop an approach for the Level 2 AR subcommittee meetings. Once developed this approach will be communicated to the Committee and if agreeable, the meetings will be scheduled. Patricia emphasized that in order for these meetings to be effective, Bureaus would need to have a willingness to negotiate priorities.
2. SystaLex commented that during due diligence for the proposal, bureaus mentioned that there is not enough lead time from CSC on what will be included in a maintenance release. The bureau participants felt that while lead time was an issue they accepted that given the two months cycle and the need to have an

accurate communication of the ARs to be included in the list, the two weeks notice was acceptable. The need for the CSC to communicate a revised delivery date for the CCR code was cited as a failure to communicate.

3. The AR closeout process was discussed and Bureaus agreed to bring information to the monthly meetings on the ARs that have been reviewed and determined that they could be closed as the problem no longer exist.

E. CBS Master Communication/Scheduling Plan

1. Patricia raised the topic of a communication plan and stated that SystaLex would assist with the development of this plan.

2. Patricia discussed the CBS Scheduling Plan which would include Maintenance Deliveries, Projects (once they had approved project plans), and the Bureaus implementation dates.

3. Patricia facilitated a discussion on the version of code that the CSC would officially support. This Committee would need to decide by what date each Bureau should have promoted a certain version of code. This Committee would also determine when a Bureau would be rated in the yellow or red status based on being behind in promoting code into their production environment. The Bureaus were asked to review the handout and be prepared to determine the status of code at the next meeting.

4. Patricia also discussed the CAMS Top Ten Projects for Fiscal Year – 2005. She informed the team of each active project and the associated lead.

5. The level 1 AR discussion included: the number of level 1 ARs, the modules and Bureaus that submitting the ARs and the current processing status.

Action items:

Description	Responsibility	Target Date
1. Provide electronic version of handouts from kickoff meeting.	CSC	Completed Nov 9th
2. Provided Feedback as to whether the 2nd Wednesday is appropriate for the regular meeting time.	Bureaus/CSC	Nov 19th
3. Provide Contact Names for the TAC Process.	CSC	Nov 19th
4. Communicate Revised Delivery Date for CCR.	CSC	In Progress - At the CBS Program Managers Meeting on Nov 10, the Bureaus were informed that CCR would not be delivered on Nov 15 and that a new date would be provided. It was communicated that this delay did not impact CSTARS or the Bureaus plans to implement CCR.
5. Evaluate AR form and provide recommendations for improvement.	Bureaus	Next Meeting – Tentatively Dec 8th
6. Provide update on major initiatives, user feedback and concerns	Bureaus	Next Meeting – Tentatively Dec 8th
7. Distribute level 1 e-mails to Committee as they arrive at CSC	CSC	TBD, Need to develop the approach.
8. Determine CSC Supported Code Version, Yellow and Red Code Version	Bureaus/CSC	Next Meeting – Tentatively Dec 8th
9. Modify report distribution POC's	CSC	TBD, need to evaluate options
10. Decide on best alternative to provide bureaus with comprehensive AR report sorted by module and number.		
11. An e-mail communicating the report changes will be sent to the individuals receiving the reports.		
12. Organize subcommittee for level 2 AR's	Bureaus/CSC	TBD
13. Organize and participate in a review of the AR form	Bureaus/CSC	Next Meeting – Tentatively Dec 8th
14. CSC Daily/Weekly Contact with Bureaus	CSC	On-going
15. Communication Plan	CSC/Bureaus	TBD
16. CBS Master Scheduling Plan	CSC/Bureaus	TBD